



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

on the theory that he was writing after the surrender at Sphacteria in 425 B. C. Others have concluded that nothing in the work of Herodotus shows knowledge of occurrences later than 428 B. C.

The reviewer must confess that he has not been convinced by Dr. Wright's argumentation in either instance. He can simply remark that it is a doubtful rehabilitation of Pausanias which makes him undertake so perilous a movement as the retreat by night from an impregnable position (p. 65) across a depression so gentle as to tempt the foe to use his cavalry—especially in view of the heterogeneity of the Greek army. Nothing short of decisive tactical superiority could justify such a risk, and if this was known to rest with the Greeks, the earlier hesitancy of the Spartan military authorities remains unexplained. Besides, it seems to result from Grundy's description (*The Great Persian War*, 499 ff.) that the depression was really suited for cavalry action.

The thesis, however, is not exhausted when these two conclusions are rejected. As a whole, it reveals sound judgment and careful work. At times, perhaps, the author does violence to historic facts in preparing the way for his theory, for example in his general characterization of the period from 479 to 449 B. C. (p. 38). Misprints, such as "golden statute of him at Delphi" (p. 84), are fortunately rare.

W. S. FERGUSON.

The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER. [College Latin Series.] (Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1904. Pp. xiv, 514.)

In the preface to this work the author states the purpose of the book "to serve as an introduction to the study of the topography of ancient Rome for students of Roman antiquities and history, and incidentally as a book of reference for those who have any special interest in the monuments which still remain". He adds a modest statement that the book "makes no claim to exhaustiveness or originality; it is only a compilation", drawn largely from Richter, "whose *Topographie der Stadt Rom* has been practically the basis of the present work". The writing of an introduction is always an ungrateful task; your prospective audience is composed of individuals whose mental status is largely a matter of theory, and it is easy for a critic to complain that the author has presupposed too little or too much knowledge on the part of his readers. Scarcely any two men would set the tone at the same place in the intellectual scale. Possibly very humble beginners may crave an additional amount of elementary explanation, but in compensation the more advanced student will find certain matters more conveniently presented than in Richter, notably in regard to bridges, aqueducts, walls, and gates. The chapter on "Building Materials and Methods" is also an improvement on Richter, but here the student will still have to go to the incomparable Middleton. It seems very unfor-

fortunate that the chapter on the "Development of the City" has no companion piece in the "Destruction of the City", a subject quite as important and equally fascinating; and one is tempted into wondering whether the book would not have been more readable had foot-notes been used more fully to contain the numerous centimeter measurements and the contradictory theories which merely interrupt the narrative when inserted directly in the text. But possibly foot-notes were avoided out of respect for the apparent prejudice which the majority of American writers have against such foot-notes as tending to make a book ponderous. As a matter of fact, however, foot-notes, if properly used, tend to lighten the narrative without sacrificing accuracy and to provide a special training-table for the more voracious of one's readers.

Roman topography is moving very rapidly these days, and it is not to be expected that any book on the subject will last long without being out of date; it is, however, all the more necessary that a book should be thoroughly up to its date of publication. In this respect Professor Platner is to be distinctly congratulated, for although our knowledge of topography is beginning to get ahead of the book (*c. g.*, p. 256, as the *lacus Curtius* has since been discovered), the author is thoroughly conversant with what had been done up to the time of writing. News of the excavation of the *ara Pacis* evidently reached America too late to be of use (p. 341). The illustrations are apt to be the worst part of a book written by a scholarly man. The publishers and the general reader are more interested in the illustrations than the author is, but in the present case the care which has evidently been given to the choice of the illustrations (*vide* the list of sources) has been rewarded, and there is much to praise. The picture of the northwest corner of the Palatine (p. 158) is out of date and had much better have been omitted. The detailed plan of the Hippodrome (p. 153) does not agree with the general plan (fig. 16, p. 128); and the plan of the Temple of Venus and Roma (p. 298) is not entirely in accord with the description on page 299.

Judged as an "introduction", the book seems open to some slight criticism. It is questionable whether the habit of giving the exact measurements (especially in the metric system) of so many things is going to be of much help to the beginner; it might serve rather as a discouragement, and certainly it is of no value to the general reader. Then too the paucity of references among the sources to the sketches of the Renaissance architects keeps the beginner in ignorance of this source, which is of constantly increasing value since Middleton's book. Then too (p. 6) a caution ought to be inserted regarding the use of coins as topographical evidence. The book is remarkably free from misprints, unless the mistakes in the points of the compass (*c. g.*, pp. 37, 127, 149, 152) are to be included under this head.

In a book which contains so many facts and theories it is an easy matter to pick out points where a difference of opinion is permissible. I mention a few such points: the statement that the "present topog-

raphy of the city is in its main features precisely the same as when the first settlements were made" (p. 15) seems rather exaggerated when one remembers the cutting down of hill spurs, the rise of artificial mounds, and the general change of level. The absence of metal in the *pons Sublicius* is not in itself a sufficient ground for dating it before the knowledge of metal (p. 79). No metal was used so that the bridge could be easily destroyed. The *atrium Vestæ* is said to have had "two and perhaps three stories" (p. 201). There were certainly three and at the south side probably five. The reference to the Anglo-Saxon coins (p. 203) were better altogether omitted unless space can be spared for some further explanation. The Ionic column of the *adricula Vestæ*, referred to as *in situ* (p. 204), is a restoration. It is by no means certain that the balustrades now standing on the pavement of the forum belonged to the rostra (p. 216); it has been repeatedly asserted but never proved, and the measurements do not seem to agree. The black marble pavement was reset by Maxentius but not originally built by him (p. 239). People did not use thick slabs of marble in the time of Maxentius. The *scalæ Gemoniæ* did not branch off from the *gradus Monetæ* (p. 278), but were merely another name for that part of the *gradus Monetæ* which was near the *Carcer*. The first triumphal arch in Rome (p. 300) was not that of Q. Fabius Allobrogicus (B. C. 121) but that of Stertinius (B. C. 196, cf. Livy, XXXIII, 27). The theory of the velaria for the Colosseum is given as a fact (p. 312), whereas it is supported on very weak evidence and has grave technical difficulties.

But these suggestions, many of which are open to discussion, touch on relatively few points, considering the large number of disputed matters with which the book has to deal. Possibly they may be of use in a subsequent edition, which will undoubtedly be demanded; at any rate they are merely the exceptions which prove the generally judicious character of the statements made.

JESSE BENEDICT CARTER.

The Private Life of the Romans. By HAROLD WHETSTONE JOHNSTON. [Lake Classical Series.] (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company. 1903. Pp. 344.)

TWENTY years ago the undergraduate classical courses in our American colleges and universities were limited somewhat strictly to the interpretation of a few select masterpieces of ancient literature. Barring an occasional lecture, no attempt was made to give formal instruction in the history of classical literature, institutions, archæology, or private life. Hence classical studies frequently used to be reproached with being narrowly grammatical and linguistic. As one father wittily said: "Homer may be the prince of poets and Demosthenes the prince of orators. But what of it, if after a dozen years' study of Greek my son hasn't a spark of enthusiasm for either?" This, of course, was